

[15th December 1923]

II

HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—"I have to announce for the information of the Council that the hon. the President has made the following nominations in regard to the House Committee:—

- (1) Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
- (2) Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.

III

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

The SECRETARY laid on the table * G.O. No. 55, Railway, dated 10th December 1923, regarding the election of two representatives of the Legislative Council to the Local Advisory Committee for the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

III-A

The SECRETARY laid on the table † Report of the Retrenchment Committee, Volumes I and II.

IV

MOTION ON A MATTER OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE TANJORE DISTRICT.

The discussion on Motion No. 12‡ moved by Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar was then resumed.

Mr. C. MARUTHAVANAM PILLAI:—Sir, in supporting the Resolution moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar I wish to make a few observations on the land revenue settlement in the Madras Presidency generally, and in the Tanjore district particularly. Sir, ever since the Munro Settlement of this Province, which denied to us the great blessings that Lord Cornwallis conferred upon the fortunate people of Bengal, it is needless to say what amount of worry, inconvenience and loss has been caused to both the rich and poor ryots of Madras by the system of resettlement at the end of every thirty years. Imagine for one moment the uncertainty that the ryots are suffering under, as regards the return of their investments in the lands, when on the mere suspicion of an increased yield, they are made to bear an increase in assessment. This process of the increase of land revenue at every resettlement is harsh; and from all appearances no great pains seem to have been taken to investigate into the actual ability or otherwise of the ryots to pay the increased taxation. The increase of 25 per cent of the land kist ordered to be levied upon the ryots of Tanjore bears ample testimony to the above remarks. The basis for this increase is not properly worked out. The soil of Tanjore district is no virgin soil. Years of cultivation has reduced its productive power and any amount of artificial manuring cannot restore the original fertility. That the maximum

* Appendix (vide pages 554—557 infra).

† Printed separately.

‡ 12. That this Council recommends to the Government that the collection of land revenue at the enhanced rate in the Tanjore district from January 1924 be suspended for one year at least till the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation.

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE 511
TANJORE DISTRICT

15th December 1923] [Mr. C. Maruthavanam Pillai]

point of production has been reached in the case of lands in the Tanjore district is a fact and any further increase in the land revenue cannot be but a gross injustice and bring excessive hardship to bear upon the ryots of the district. Add to this the fall in the price of paddy, the failure of the monsoon, the occasional droughts, the unseasonal rains, the scarcity of water-supply in the Cauvery that is sure to result out of the Kannambadi scheme, the increased cost of the necessities of life, the payment of higher wages for cultivation, the increased cost of manuring and a thousand other causes all of which tend only to aggravate the ryots' indebtedness and misery. Then the Government, however apathetic it may happen to be, cannot with any amount of conscience dare to crush down the Tanjore landholders with any more increased taxation the summit of which has already been reached by the previous settlement.

"It is on these grounds I presume that the previous House passed by a majority the Permanent Settlement Bill which, it is understood, the Government do not mean to take up. It behoves us therefore to reintroduce that measure in due time.

"As we all know, Sir, the Government have decided not to give effect to the Bill in the near future. I am sure the present House will again take up that question in due time. But before anything is done on a permanent and legislative basis, to force upon the ryots' slender means an additional 25 per cent of Land Revenue is not only unfair and unjust but also very cruel and oppressive.

"Just a word more and I shall finish. Several of the hon. Members of this House seem to be labouring under a misnomer that the district of Tanjore is incomparably fertile and as such the recent increase is justifiable. While admitting mainly the truth of the statement, I would only point out that the rates of assessment since the *paimash* days are equally higher, reaching up to even Rs. 15 per acre in some cases. I therefore beg to support the Resolution which I am sure you will accept by a large majority and do bare justice to the already overburdened mirasidars of the Tanjore district."

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR:—"Mr. Deputy President, the other day when a similar Motion was moved by the hon. Member, Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, my hon. Friend Mr. Siva Rao gave a history of the whole subject as to how a committee was appointed to consider the lines on which the Land Revenue Bill should be drafted, how that Committee thought that its recommendations should be embodied in the Land Revenue Bill, how in the meantime the question of permanent settlement had to be postponed, and how the undertaking given by the Government that a Land Revenue Bill would be introduced had not been given effect to. We had the opportunity of hearing the recommendations of the Decentralization Commission read out to us by more than one hon. Member. Sir, when a Motion was introduced by my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, we expected that something good would come out of it. But, Sir, our recommendations were put an end to when the hon. the Home Member said clearly that there was no room for us to think that the introduction of the permanent settlement would be considered with any favour by the Central Government."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I correct the hon. Member, Sir? I did not say anything about the Central Government. What I said was that there was no prospect of the Local Government introducing such legislation in the near future."

[15th December 1923]

MR. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“ I think, Sir, it comes to the same thing. Whatever it may be, with regard to the recommendation of the Decentralization Commission, that legislation with regard to matters of taxation should be gradually introduced, the hon. the Home Member told us that four years' time was too early to think of such a thing, and went to the extent of saying that the recommendations framed by a Committee last year, that the settlement rates should obtain the sanction of the Legislature before they were introduced, were revolutionary. He also told this House that the settlement rates depended upon a contract with the Government and that, as soon as a thirty years' period was over, the Government were at liberty to introduce the resettlement rates, though he gave an undertaking—I think it is a poor undertaking—that he would consider the conditions of the respective district and make necessary remission. Most of us, Sir, represent the ryots in the districts; we know the conditions of the ryots; their conditions have not been improved. We know that the yield of the land has not increased in any way. At the same time, the other day a few facts and figures were quoted to us comparing one district with another, and it was sought to impress upon us that the condition of the ryots had improved, and the yield of the land was increasing. But we the Members coming from different districts know what the real condition of the ryots is. In these circumstances, I think there is only one course open to us and that is to join in a united body in supporting the Resolution that has been placed before the House, and I hope that many more Motions like this will be brought forward, and that the House with one united voice will support them also. If we do so, I hope a way will be opened for us, though not for the introduction of the permanent settlement, at least to have the recommendations framed last year embodied in the Land Revenue Bill.”

MR. VENKATARAMA AYYAR alias V. PANTULU AYYAR :—“ Mr. Deputy President, when we whole-heartedly and unanimously passed the resolution for the postponement of resettlement in the Bellary district, I was under the impression—and I think I am right—that we were fighting for a principle and not for the sake of Bellary alone. If a series of unfavourable seasons intervene, Bellary is entitled only to remission for that year or for those years when the crops fail and no legislation would have been necessary. When in this House a victory has been gained in Bellary it was a victory for the principle that there should be no taxation without legislation and so I thought I had no further business on this subject, because what applies to one district—I mean to say with regard to the land tax—equally applies to other districts also. But it seems that our district is unfortunate. It has a very bad reputation (hear, hear! and laughter). The imagination of poets and the erroneous records of the Settlement Department have ascribed to it a fertility which it certainly does not deserve, and I think hon. Members of this House passing along the railway line which runs in the most fertile portion of the district—a portion which contains the most industrious population—the Muhammadans—betel gardens and plantain and coconut topes—have a belief that our district is so fertile that the people have simply to go to the fields, sow the seeds and wait till the time of harvest when they have simply to garner their paddy in their graneries. I may tell the House, Sir, that if you go into the interior a sorry spectacle is presented, especially in recent years after the regulation of the waters of the branch rivers of the river Cauvery, you will find that no silt is carried in those rivers. I think the

15th December 1923] [Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar alia; V. Pantulu Ayyar]

hon. the Home Member said that silt is even now carried. But expert opinion is that a certain amount of velocity is required to carry the silt. Our practical experience is that the water which is carried to the field is not so much for the purpose of fertilizing the fields as for irrigating them. Another point which I wish to mention is that there are only a very few mirasidars in our district who are very rich. But there are more than a hundred thousand mirasidars who are in a very poor condition and who are living from hand to mouth, and any enhancement of tax even in the slightest degree will affect them to a very great extent. I hope this question will not be considered as a party question. It is a question in which a large number of people are affected. As I have already said, hundreds of thousands of people are sure to be affected and I leave it to the justice of the House to consider what the fate of these poor families will be, if the Executive Government is allowed to enhance the tax at their own sweet will and pleasure without having any recourse to legislation.

“ About this resettlement question, I think another argument has been advanced, viz., that there is very little complaint in our district regarding the payment of tax, and that taxes are paid at the first demand. I may tell you, Sir, that the Revenue officials in our district have got their own way of putting things and in this connexion I may quote the proverbial saying ‘that Cauvery water is supposed to give intelligence’ and I may add that it has certainly given acute intelligence in the case of these Revenue officials. With the permission of the House, I shall proceed to cite an instance, Sir, as to how a case was made out where there was an absolute failure of crop. A written petition was sent to the Deputy Collector about the failure of the crops and a demand for remission was made. The Deputy Collector inspected the concerned village and saw that absolutely no crops had been harvested. At that time some of the people thought that an application should be made for clearing the channel next year and under the Kudimaramath Act they sent in a petition to the Deputy Collector for that purpose. The Deputy Collector came to the village for inspecting the lands and I asked him what his opinion of the harvest was. He said ‘yes, Sir, it may be true that the crops have failed absolutely, and I have got a petition asking for remission of tax. There is also another petition with me in which it is stated that the channels have not been cleared and that the people want that channel to be cleared by the department. From this I understand, Sir, that the failure of the crop is due to the channel not being cleared.’ And I may tell you, Sir, further that the channel was cleared and according to the Kudimaramath Act a channel tax was collected from the poor people, so that the people had to pay not only the tax on land but also double the clearing charges according to the Act which levies a penal tax, of which, I think one-sixth would have been spent on the real clearance. These are the ways in which the administration is conducted.

“ It is mentioned in the records that all channels which supply water to
11-30 a.m. over 3,000 acres are under the maintenance of the Public Works Department. Sir, when the channel in the Melattur village which is irrigating over 4,000 acres had to be cleared, the people sent in a petition to the Public Works Department for the purpose saying that that work should be undertaken by that department and that it was not right to ask the ryots to clear it at their own expense. To this petition the Public Works Department was graciously pleased to reply saying that the ryots were

[Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar alias V. Pantulu Ayyar] [15th December 1923]

allowed to clear the channel. Of course, I think if there is an obligation on the part of the ryots to discharge their duties and pay taxes, the Government also has got an obligation towards the ryots which I think they have absolutely failed to fulfil.

“Under the present resettlement, a ryot who holds about two acres and odd and who was paying Rs. 20, is now assessed to pay Rs. 39. So it is not only a 25 per cent increase as some Members stated, but it is very nearly double that of the previous assessment.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“May I know, Sir, if it is single crop or double crop?”

MR. VENKATARAMA AYYAR alias V. PANTULU AYYAR :—“It is single crop. But, on account of the heavy taxation and other expenses, the unfortunate ryot thought that he could double his income by putting double crop. After trying for two years he failed. Because, conditions in our district are such—I am speaking from practical experience—that two crops never succeed. One crop or the other fails generally. So, the unfortunate ryot who tried for two years not only lost much but when the settlement officer visited the area, it was considered that that area was fit for double crop and assessed accordingly by him. Thus, Sir, not only the unfortunate ryot who tried this experiment suffered, but also the people who hold lands in the same block, suffered. Because, the Government think that if one man has been foolish enough to make such an experiment, others must have followed suit and they assess the whole area to double crop. This is the way in which settlement has been carried on. Therefore I think that unless legislation on a sound basis is made in respect of settlement without leaving it to the executive order, the people of our district will suffer. For this reason I call upon this hon. House not to be overcome by the delusion that our district is fabulously fertile, but to have recourse to calm reasoning and to practical facts, viz., that this year just a little before the first crop was about to be harvested, there was such a heavy flood in consequence of which even the railway line was breached which hon. Members might have known—that the first crop was lost, and, as for the second crop, had it not been for a few drops of rain which fell in a favoured area the whole of the district would have been suffering from drought. There is no rain in most parts of the district. Under these circumstances, I think our district is as much entitled as Bellary can be, for the concession asked for, viz., suspension of the enhanced rates for one year till legislation is enacted on land taxes. With these few words, I heartily support the Resolution.”

MR. P. ANJANEYALU :—“Sir, when the Resolution for a similar purpose was brought forward and passed regarding Bellary, I thought that it did not pertain to Bellary alone, that we were not giving that concession to Bellary alone on account of the series of woes catalogued, but that we were enunciating a principle, viz., that we recommended to the Government that the collection of land revenue at the enhanced rates should not be given effect to till the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation. That I thought was the basic principle though it was applied, in that particular case, to one district only. The hon. the Law Member was calling our attention to the principle of *res judicata* on altogether a different occasion. If I may take advantage of that principle, I would apply it to this case more than to the case he attempted to apply; because, the parties are the same, the ryots on the one side and the Government on the other; the principle is the same and the conclusion should

15th December 1923]

[Mr. P. Anjaneyalu]

also be the same. When once the principle is adopted in the case of Bellary, I think the same principle should be applied in the case of Tanjore, Ganjam, Cuddapah or any other district in this Presidency. In view of this fact and in view of the fact that the Resolution of Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar only asks in a very modest manner that collection at the increased rate should be suspended for one year only, the whole House including the hon. Members on the other side (Ministerialists' side) should vote for this Resolution as they voted in the case of Bellary."

MR. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, I rise to support this Resolution of my hon. Friend Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar very strongly. I said in supporting the Resolution of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar that we ought not to enter into the parlour of the hon. the Law Member and allow district jealousies to be exploited by stating that this district is poor and that is rich and thereby setting one district against another. The whole House practically unanimously voted in favour of that Resolution. I take it, as other Members of this House, I am sure, take it, that we were fighting not for Bellary, but for the assertion of a principle, the principle, viz., that no resettlement proposals ought to be given effect to until this House has approved of the principles of resettlement in the form of sound legislation. Now, Sir, I may remind this House that the hon. the Home Member and the Revenue Secretary put up a very strenuous fight and pointed out to this House that Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar's original Resolution would have met with sympathy at their hands because it referred to the peculiar circumstances of Bellary and Anantapur, but we rejected that plea and voted for the Resolution in favour of the resettlement proposal being postponed; and luckily now, as I view it, within two days the test has come to Members of this House whether in voting for that Resolution we were simply allowing ourselves to be influenced by considerations not germane to the Resolution in the amended form as it stood or whether we were standing for the assertion of the principle, viz., no representation, no taxation or that no tax of this kind ought to be increased or levied without the consent of this House. Sir, I am obliged to the Ministerialist organ *The Justice* of yesterday which says:

'That long before the Joint Committee report of the House of Lords and the House of Commons sat to decide on this question and asked that this revenue settlement principle should be given legislative form, the Decentralization Commission which sat very much earlier have said: we consider that the general principles of assessment such as, for instance, the proportion of the net profit of the land which the Government shall be entitled to take and the period of settlement shall be embodied in a piece of legislation instead of being left to executive order as is now the case outside Bombay.'

"Then the Joint Committee report came on, and four years and a half have elapsed since then. Therefore, Sir, in spite of the opinions of those who are best entitled to speak upon it according to the Government themselves, they have not lifted their little finger to take this settlement out of the hands of the Executive and place it under the control of the Legislature.

"Now, I must confess to some inability, Mr. Deputy President, to understand the position of the Government; either they are ready with this Settlement Bill or they are not. Because, in answer to a question by my hon. Friend Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar, the hon. the Law Member said that among the various Bills that would come up in this Session, the Revenue Settlement Bill was one. If, therefore, this Bill is coming up before this

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[15th December 1923]

House this session, surely the Government cannot have very serious objections to postponing giving effect to this resettlement proposal till after that Bill becomes law. If, on the other hand, the Government have no such intention, let them say so plainly that they have no intention of bringing forward this Bill very early."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I make a personal explanation, Sir? I am really astonished at the shortness of my hon. Friend's memory. Either his memory is short or he was not attending to the debates of the other day. I gave a positive assurance that the Bill would be introduced as soon as possible, probably this session. There is no question whatever of Government having no intention of legislating as early as possible. It is only fair that the hon. Member should accept as genuine an undertaking of that kind."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I do accept that undertaking, Sir, and my argument itself is based upon that. If the Government have any such intention, I do not understand their anxiety to prevent this Resolution being carried. The scope of the Resolution of my hon. Friend becomes very limited seeing that there is an assurance from the Government that they will introduce this Bill this session. Why should not the Government wait for some little time and then have the resettlement proposals effectuated."

"Sir, a great deal has been said about the resettlement proposals of Mr. Jackson upon which all these proposals are based. I have nothing but admiration for the comprehensive and exhaustive way in which the settlement officer has gone into the whole question. Surely hon. Members of this House are entitled to criticise that report and advance reasons as to why the Government should not be allowed to carry out the proposals contained therein, to the extent we can."

"The first connected paper to which I believe reference was made already was this: that thirty years ago the land revenue of Tanjore was raised by 29 per cent and, thirty years hence now, the district is asked to pay from 18½ to 25 per cent more. I think it will be conceded on all hands that whatever the reasonableness of the reasons which may be advanced in respect of that may be, the mere arithmetic of it must stagger some of us who know the perpetual poverty in which the majority of the people in Tanjore have to live and have their being. But the Settlement Officer suggested and the Government practically accepted the view that all these increases in the land tax are merely due to the rise in prices. Now, I believe I have heard here and elsewhere this, viz., that the rise in prices is not as high as it used to be, that prices have fallen down and that, therefore, other circumstances must be presumed to have changed. If this is so, it must operate to the detriment also of these tax-payers who are asked to pay these increased taxes. Now, Sir, I would again quote, in spite of the hon. the Home Member's deprecation, Sir O'Moore Creagh. He says in his book: 'The rise in prices is against the agriculturist in nearly every district; in the few cases where some of those who produce for sale might get some advantage, their ignorance prevents them doing so to its full extent.' I would ask the House to take the opinion of Sir O'Moore Creagh also into account before they decide this important matter."

"Now, Sir, one important argument which my hon. Friend advanced and I am sure the House has taken note of, was the argument based on this, viz., that the cultivation expenses were not given sufficient allowance in the proposals made by the Settlement Officer and accepted by the Revenue Board."

15th December 1923]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

and the Government. On that matter, Sir, I am anxious to invite the attention of the House to the very illuminating remarks of Mr. Dutt who recommended to the Government in very strong terms that the allowances made by Mr. Jackson were not correct and that they ought to be revised.

“ He says :

‘ After his very careful consideration of the subject from many points of view it looks as if Mr. Jackson is after all rather doubtful if his deduction for cultivation expenses is quite adequate. I request the Board that in considering the scheme report special care may be taken to see that for the standard outturns the cultivation expenses allowed in the scheme report are adequate, and if Mr. Jackson’s estimate of cultivation expenses be found to be an underestimate, the suggested rate of increase in the assessment may be decreased.’

“ That was the recommendation made but the Government at page 276 of this report simply turn the whole thing down and say that
11-45 a.m. they must take the original allowances as the final word on the matter.

“ There is one other matter which I want to lay stress upon in this House with all the emphasis that I can command. I am not going into the question whether Tanjore may not be and any other district may be a richer district. But, Sir, I want to say this. Please do not judge Tanjore by the few Tanjore mirasidars whom we have met here and elsewhere. Tanjore is a very big tract of country and at least in two taluks, Arantangi and Pattukkottai, with which I am familiar there is no irrigation system worth mentioning and people have got to depend on the rain or the monsoon which rarely comes there. Apart from that there are at least 65 per cent of the ryots paying less than Rs. 10 on their pattas. It is the case of these unfortunate ryots which I appeal to this House to consider most carefully before voting upon this question. It is not the question of a few rich men being made to pay some more rupees or some less. But the question is whether this House is going to allow the resettlement proposals to affect the lives and happiness of 65 per cent of the Tanjore mirasidars as they are honorifically called. And on this matter I have the very high authority of the Collector of the district who at page 271 in forwarding this report says :

‘ Our settlement rules do not discriminate between big and small ryots, but unless some discrimination is made—’

“ I want the House to mark the words :

‘ in favour of small ryots who have no crops to sell, they will be worse off than they were before ’.

“ I ask the House to consider whether they would be a party to placing 65 per cent of these unfortunate fellow countrymen of theirs in Tanjore, to quote the words of the Collector himself : ‘ in a worse position than they were before ’. That is the first question this Resolution raises. I want this House to give a considered vote upon it. Something should be done, if not to improve, at least not to make worse their condition by increase of assessment. These are not the words of a little fry but the words of a responsible Collector to the Government in regard to this important matter. But Mr. Dutt is an Indian. I should mention to this House, Mr. Deputy President, that the Government in dealing with this matter take a somewhat nonchalant view and indeed do not think they are called upon to deal with it. They say that they cannot take into account all these considerations. Sir, if hon Members will kindly look at the Resolution they will find that it does not want resettlement

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[15th December 1923]

House this session, surely the Government cannot have very serious objections to postponing giving effect to this resettlement proposal till after that Bill becomes law. If, on the other hand, the Government have no such intention, let them say so plainly that they have no intention of bringing forward this Bill very early."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I make a personal explanation, Sir? I am really astonished at the shortness of my hon. Friend's memory. Either his memory is short or he was not attending to the debates of the other day. I gave a positive assurance that the Bill would be introduced as soon as possible, probably this session. There is no question whatever of Government having no intention of legislating as early as possible. It is only fair that the hon. Member should accept as genuine an undertaking of that kind."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I do accept that undertaking, Sir, and my argument itself is based upon that. If the Government have any such intention, I do not understand their anxiety to prevent this Resolution being carried. The scope of the Resolution of my hon. Friend becomes very limited seeing that there is an assurance from the Government that they will introduce this Bill this session. Why should not the Government wait for some little time and then have the resettlement proposals effectuated."

"Sir, a great deal has been said about the resettlement proposals of Mr. Jackson upon which all these proposals are based. I have nothing but admiration for the comprehensive and exhaustive way in which the settlement officer has gone into the whole question. Surely hon. Members of this House are entitled to criticise that report and advance reasons as to why the Government should not be allowed to carry out the proposals contained therein, to the extent we can."

"The first connected paper to which I believe reference was made already was this: that thirty years ago the land revenue of Tanjore was raised by 29 per cent and, thirty years hence now, the district is asked to pay from 18½ to 25 per cent more. I think it will be conceded on all hands that whatever the reasonableness of the reasons which may be advanced in respect of that may be, the mere arithmetic of it must stagger some of us who know the perpetual poverty in which the majority of the people in Tanjore have to live and have their being. But the Settlement Officer suggested and the Government practically accepted the view that all these increases in the land tax are merely due to the rise in prices. Now, I believe I have heard here and elsewhere this, viz., that the rise in prices is not as high as it used to be, that prices have fallen down and that, therefore, other circumstances must be presumed to have changed. If this is so, it must operate to the detriment also of these tax-payers who are asked to pay these increased taxes. Now, Sir, I would again quote, in spite of the hon. the Home Member's deprecation, Sir O'Moore Creagh. He says in his book: 'The rise in prices is against the agriculturist in nearly every district; in the few cases where some of those who produce for sale might get some advantage, their ignorance prevents them doing so to its full extent.' I would ask the House to take the opinion of Sir O'Moore Creagh also into account before they decide this important matter."

"Now, Sir, one important argument which my hon. Friend advanced and I am sure the House has taken note of, was the argument based on this, viz., that the cultivation expenses were not given sufficient allowance in the proposals made by the Settlement Officer and accepted by the Revenue Board."

15th December 1923] [Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

there are many persons in this House and outside it who are very anxious to go about and represent, and more often misrepresent, the views of hon. Members here and their reason for giving their votes in a particular way. Charges of inconsistency have been freely levelled both by my hon. Friend from Coimbatore and the hon. Member for the University. I wish to point out, if I may, that the charge, if at all it can be brought forward, it can be more properly brought forward against the Members themselves. The Resolution regarding the Bellary and Anantapur settlement was one that asked for the postponement of the operation till the introduction of a Settlement Bill. And I wish to explain the reasons that induced us on this side of the House in supporting that Motion. They were, Bellary and Anantapur are districts which are peculiarly situated; year after year, time after time, famines visit the district and only the year before last, and even last year, this Council voted large sums of money for the relief of these famine-stricken districts. My hon. Friend, Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, gave statistics of the last ten or fifteen years, read out remarks of various Collectors, which showed clearly that Bellary was an unfortunate district overtaken by famine year after year. This Council, or rather its predecessor, on two occasions voted for the postponement of resettlement proposals in Bellary, and for exactly the same reasons we on this side of the House felt that in a district so peculiarly affected as Bellary it would only be in the fairness of things that resettlement operations should again be postponed for some time longer. Moreover, the conditions that are now prevailing in Bellary are not suitable for resettlement operations. Famine has not yet left the district, the monsoon has failed miserably, the total rainfall being nearly only 50 per cent of the average rainfall. It is for that reason, Sir, among others, that we voted for that Resolution. The second reason that swayed me and most of the Members that voted with me on that Resolution was this. The Government had expected some time back that a Resettlement Bill would be introduced early in the life of the last Legislative Council. We had brought forward a Resolution that a Resettlement Bill should be soon introduced and the Government of the day took care to frame a Bill, had a special committee appointed, and, I believe, the hon. the Revenue Member at one stage announced that that Bill was ready for introduction. My hon. Friend from Nellore later brought in a Resolution for permanent settlement, on which the whole House was unanimous. The Resolution was passed, and it obviously necessitated a reference to the Government of India, and I do not know what has happened afterwards. I understand informally that the Government of India have negatived, for the time being, the proposal for a permanent settlement. The hon. the Revenue Member, I believe, stated once in this House that he was precluded from introducing the Resettlement Bill because the House had committed itself to permanent settlement. Now, Sir, we wanted to say that so far as the Legislative Council is concerned we were anxious that a Bill should be introduced at a very early stage and we wanted also that in the Legislative Assembly those great patriots who have taken their places now would be good enough in the interests of the ryots of whom so much is heard here, to move for the introduction of permanent settlement. We have no power in the face of the Government of India's order to ask for permanent settlement now, but all that is left for us is to see that Government introduce a Bill and to modify that Bill according to the best interests of the ryots when it comes up for discussion. And therefore we wanted a

[Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [15th December 1923]

leverage by which the Government could be expedited in introducing the Settlement Bill in this Presidency. The reason why we passed the Resolution regarding Bellary was that if we put off the resettlement in one district the Government was bound to introduce the Bill sooner than later. Those were the two reasons, Sir, why we voted for the Resolution regarding Bellary and Anantapur. Sir, the Resolution as regards Tanjore stands on entirely a different footing. And consistency points out only one course to me. An identical Resolution was brought forward before the last Legislative Council, early this year and the House by a large majority voted against it. How then, Sir, is the attitude of the Council open to the charge of inconsistency if it voted against this Resolution now?"

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask the hon. Member to which Resolution he refers?"

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" The Resolution that was brought forward by the then Member for Tanjore, Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—" May I correct my hon. Friend? In fact, Sir, no Resolution was brought as regards Tanjore. The Resolution which my hon. Friend refers to is probably that in connexion with Bellary which Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai supported."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" So far as Tanjore district is concerned, it has no peculiar features as Bellary and Anantapur. The hon. the Mover gave a long catalogue of the grievances of ryots in Tanjore and said that in the proposed resettlement the value of this and that was not taken into consideration, the value of the bulls, the expenses of cultivation, etc. These are the normal features which are present at every resettlement. It is exactly the reason why we are dissatisfied with the executive order, with the valuation put by the resettlement officers on the cost of labour, cattle and other things, it is exactly for that reason that we want a Resettlement Bill to be brought as soon as possible and leave things on a statutory basis. That does not however mean, Sir, that special favour should be shown to Tanjore."

12 noon. "The district of Chingleput has had its resettlement recently, and under that resettlement the land revenue of the district has been enhanced. In South Arcot there was such a resettlement about 4 years ago. In all these the same identical reasons could have been brought forward, and they were brought forward by the then Members of the Legislative Council. The late hon. Diwan Bahadur A. Subbarayalu Reddiyar, the late Minister for Education, brought forward a Resolution regarding the resettlement in South Arcot on the grounds that the valuations made were not proper, that the executive was not fair to the ryots and so on. Now, this is quite different from saying that the resettlement should be postponed. My hon. Friend who has moved this Resolution must himself admit, that after a resettlement there is bound to be some increase or other in the rates. Now, what would be the position if we accept the Resolution and postpone the resettlement for one year? The hon. Mover wants that for one year Tanjore should go Scot-free. If he had brought forward a Resolution to the effect that the present resettlement rates were high, that they should be altered or reduced by 25 per cent or 50 per cent, that in the Kumbakonam taluk there should be only 18 per cent increase but not 25 per cent, that in some other taluk the increase should not be 18 per cent but only 15 per cent or 12 per cent, I could understand his proposal, and I should have thought twice before

15th December 1923] [Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

I voted against such a Resolution. A great deal has been said about the ryots, but my hon. Friends have not made any distinction between the wealthy mirasidars and the poor ryots. Advantages to the one class may not be so advantageous to the other class, and consideration should be given to the poverty of the ryots. What is asked for in the Resolution is merely this: that for one year there should be no enhancement and the resettlement should be postponed. That is to say, that not only they continue to have the old rates for 30 years after the old settlement was brought into effect, but that the old rates would continue during the 31st year also, and that the same advantages would accrue to the people of Tanjore for one year more. That is a position which I cannot understand. Are we to lose the ten or fifteen lakhs which is the expected enhancement, and leave all of it to the Tanjore people merely because a Resolution has been tabled? The most proper thing to have been done was that a Resolution on the merits of the question should have been brought forward.

“Again, Sir, a Bill for resettlement will shortly be introduced, and we have the assurance of the hon. the Home Member on the point. If the resettlement of the Tanjore district is now given effect to, there is nothing on earth to prevent us from moving in that Bill an Amendment to the effect that the settlement rates in districts which have been resettled during the last ten years should be revised in the light of the principles enunciated by that Bill. The Tanjore resettlement would be coming into effect on the 1st April 1924 and the Revenue Bill is expected to come up for discussion in August or so. When that is the case, and when the Bill after consideration by the Council, is passed at the end of 1924 or the beginning of the following year, there is nothing on earth to prevent us from moving Amendments to that Bill, or to add a special clause to the Bill to the effect that the resettlement rates introduced into the several districts during the last few years, which are abnormal rates of increase and were fixed without any regard to the principles which have been since accepted by the House, be reconsidered in the light of the principles enunciated in that Bill. In that way, the claims of, for instance, a district like South Arcot or a district like Chingleput may be introduced for consideration, and they may be benefited. But what my hon. Friend the Mover wants is a blank cheque for his own district of Tanjore, which, I for one, in the interests of the neighbouring districts, in the interests of the general tax-payer, and the interests of the ryots of the Chingleput district whom I represent here, I am not prepared to support.”

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—“Mr. Deputy President, Sir, I rise to support this Motion on two grounds. The first is the principle that taxation should not be levied by executive order but must have the sanction of the legislature. As to that principle many hon. Members on this (left) side of the House have spoken, and as to the soundness of that principle I do not think there is any difference of opinion in the House. The very fact that the Government have agreed to introduce a Bill embodying the principles of resettlement itself shows that the principle by itself is sound. But the question whether resettlement should be postponed in view of the expected Bill seems to be much debated. Sir, a Resolution almost to this effect was passed in this House two days ago, and Members of this House who supported that Resolution will, I believe, stultify their own opinions if they were to oppose this Motion. One hon. Member, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, told us that if there was anything in the principle which supported that Motion it was mostly against the

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[15th December 1923]

proposition but not for supporting it. This is how, I understand, it would be. If the hon. Members did really support that Motion moved by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, they ought to have supported the original Motion as it was. It would have been something. But if they supported the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Siva Rao, there is no option left but to support this Motion also because that Motion represents a certain principle, namely, that the resettlement ought to be postponed till the Bill for settling the principles of resettlement is introduced and passed. I would like to ask the hon. Member one question. Supposing the Bill is not brought forward this year or the Bill is not passed for five years more, and supposing that the Resolution is accepted, it amounts to this: till that Bill is passed no resettlement ought to be made in Bellary. So, Sir, the Members who have supported that Resolution, if they want to be consistent with their own principles, ought to support this Motion also. But my reason for supporting this Motion is not only that principle but it is more than that. Hon. Members, or most of them, seem to believe that the ryots are capable of indefinite taxation. I for one do not say that there should not be any taxation on the ryots, but so far as I am aware the conditions are different, and I have got some experience of the ryots at least of four or five districts. I am very grateful to the hon. Members who have sympathised with the districts with which I am more or less in acquaintance. But still, I believe, leaving alone individual cases of rich landholders, the ryots and small landholders, wherever they are in the Presidency, do really deserve a lot of sympathy, indeed more than what is usually expected from hon. Members. I believe their lot is very hard. The conditions have entirely changed for some years. The poor landholder who has about one or two acres on which to depend in the villages has nothing else to fall back upon but those one or two acres. Probably some years before, they were able to depend upon some other supplementary occupation, but most of them have died out. Except a few acres—in most cases not even an acre—they have nothing else. I know in some parts of Bellary, Kurnool and Cuddapah, some people depend entirely on one or two acres if not less and have nothing else to do in the villages except to depend on those one or two acres. I believe in other districts also there are such small landholders, and the hon. the Mover has given us figures that in Tanjore, which is supposed to be the richest district, there are at least 65 per cent of people who have to depend on one or two acres. I ask hon. Members what would be the effect of increasing the rates under such circumstances. If the Government has given us an undertaking that in the case of small landholders, such an increase would not be made, probably I would heartily support it. I really believe, as the Collector Mr. Dutt, who certainly must have had much experience of the villages, told us, there ought to be made in future a discrimination between the small landholder and the big landholder, and I hope that that would be the question to be considered in future. One hon. Member told us the other day that even if the principles of settlement are codified there would not be much difference between the principles which are now guiding the Executive in their enhancement of the taxes and the principles of the future Bill. I really doubt very much whether that will be the case. I do not really think that this House is so poor of talent as not to be able to suggest some better principles or some better methods of taxing the people. The case of the small landholder, for whom there is no provision at all at present in the measures proposed, is one in point. I believe this House

15th December 1923]

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

will come to an understanding with regard to the case of the small landholder in future legislation on the Settlement Bill.

(At this stage the hon. the President took the Chair.)

"So, Sir, I believe that the lot of the ordinary small landholders, wherever they may be, either in Tanjore, or in Cuddapah, or in Godavari, is really very hard, and they cannot any longer bear any increased taxation. As at present the principles of settlement do not make any difference between a small landholder and the big landholder, I cannot give my support to any enhancement in future until the Bill is introduced and until we have an opportunity of discussing the whole matter as to what we should do with regard to the small landholders and big landholders, whether we can suggest any better methods by which the sufferings of the small landholders can in any way be alleviated. That is my main ground for supporting the Motion.

"The second ground, which may seem to many hon. Members somewhat revolutionary, is at least one in which I feel very strongly. I find that somehow or other in this Presidency the taxes which are collected mostly from the villagers are spent mostly in the improvement of towns. I, coming here as representative of the villages, feel very strongly that the ryots have been very badly treated in so far as the matter of spending the taxes collected from them is concerned. In whatever way we may view the manner in which the taxes are spent, we find that the villagers have been practically neglected. Take, for instance, a hospital or a school building. Where are they built? They are built in the towns, and the advantages the villagers obtain from them are very little indeed. Probably with regard to the roads and the improvement thereof they do have some advantage. Lakhs have been spent on water-supply schemes for towns, but not a pie has been spent for the villagers. Very little, if at all, has been spent recently for the depressed classes in the way of improving their drinking water-supply and giving them more facilities in that respect. I would therefore put it to the House that in future Members representing the villages ought to be more careful in seeing that the taxes collected from the ryots are spent more equitably than has been the case hitherto. On that ground also, I support this Motion, because I believe any amount of money obtained by enhancement of taxes from the villagers would only, as matters at present stand, be spent not so much for the convenience of the villagers, as ought to be the case, but on schemes which do not benefit the villagers. On the ground of principle, which I mentioned before, and secondly on the ground of the way in which taxes are spent more for the convenience of towns than for villages, I support this Motion. I would add that if hon. Members do not support this Motion, they will only be stultifying the opinions that they expressed with regard to another similar Motion made by the hon. Member Mr. Siva Rao."

12-15 p.m. Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, during the course of the debate in my opening speech on the Resolution, I referred to certain facts and figures and stated to this House how the resettlement rates now proposed in the Tanjore district are not justifiable even on the figures given by the Settlement Officer. In reply, I had from the Government Benches answers to very few of the difficulties which I raised and I may say that none of the arguments which I advanced in favour of the postponement of the resettlement as regards the Tanjore district has been really answered by the other side.

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [15th December 1923]

"I first said that the standard outturn, as given by the Settlement Officer, is very much exaggerated, and that the figures given by him are wrong. It is true that Mr. Paddison referred to certain figures from the very same page which I referred to and that in those cases the outturn was above the standard outturn. But may I remind this House that the lands which are there considered by Mr. Jackson were lands in the Manganallore experimental farm? It is true that it is stated that these lands were not lands on which experiments were carried on. But every hon. Member here knows that lands in the agricultural farms are lands under the control of the Government in which money is lavishly spent, to which labour is unstintedly available, and to which any amount of irrigation facilities are also available, because of the influence which the agricultural officers have with the Public Works Department. Therefore, these ought not to be taken as the criterion on which the yield of ordinary lands under mirasidars ought to be calculated. These are the only figures which the hon. Member, Mr. Paddison, referred to, and certainly he did not attempt to explain the figures lower down the same page, where the yield is given of the same lands before they came to be taken up by the Agricultural Department, and I showed to the House yesterday that the yield of those lands was only three-fourths or two-thirds of the standard outturn. I have said enough on this point and I do not think hon. Members of this House will take the figures which were given by Mr. Paddison yesterday as the outturn to be correct.

"Then, as regards the cost of cultivation, there is one point which I incidentally referred to yesterday, and which I want to emphasize in more detail, since, in a conversation which I had with Mr. Paddison this morning, he seemed to be under some misapprehension. Hon. Members will see from page 55 of the Scheme Report that there is a graded list of cultivation expenses for lands of the first class, for lands of the second class and for lands of the third class and so on. From the preceding pages hon. Members will find that what is really calculated by the Settlement Officer is the cultivation expenses for one acre of the best land that is paying Rs. 14 an acre. From that he says that for lands paying a lower rate of tax, a lower rate of cultivation expenses will do, so much so that for the last class of lands the Settlement Officer thinks that Rs. 10 will do for cultivation expenses per acre. I am not able to understand the logic of that. Supposing a land of the first class requires Rs. 20 an acre to cultivate. I cannot imagine how you can cultivate a land of the third class with Rs. 10 an acre. I suppose the labour is the same, seed is the same, the bull is the same and the other costs of cultivation are the same. This theory of graded scale of cultivation expenses cannot at all be accepted, and Mr. Jackson himself, with rather hesitation, has to follow that because it was a procedure adopted in the previous Settlement. As regards the cultivation expense itself, the then Collector of Tanjore, in forwarding the report to the Board of Revenue, says:

'The conclusion which these results point out is that the scale of cultivation expenses above proposed is a possible one for the low Tanjore standard of farming, but that is by no means liberal. I am inclined to regard it as the minimum expenditure which can be expected to produce the standard outturn. After his very careful consideration of the subject from many points of view it looks as if Mr. Jackson is after all rather doubtful if his deduction for cultivation expenses is quite adequate. I request the Board that, in considering the Scheme Report, special care may be taken to see that for the standard outturns the cultivation expenses allowed in the Scheme Report are adequate, and if Mr. Jackson's estimate of cultivation expenses be found to be an under-estimate, the suggested rate of increase in the assessment may be decreased.'

15th December 1923] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

“So, as regards the cultivation expenses, what I stated to the House yesterday is perfectly correct, and no possible explanation has been attempted by the other side except saying that, as regards *maniam* and other perquisites given to these farm labourers, Mr. Jackson has taken them all into consideration. I only wish to refer to the passage referred to yesterday at page 52, where he expressly says that if these things are to be allowed the cultivation expenses would be higher and he does not allow those things in his calculation of the cultivation expenses.

“Then I would refer to page 55. I said that the ordinary class of land in the district paying Rs. 8 assessment is giving a net profit of Rs. 14 per acre to the landholder if the increased rate of assessment of Rs. 10 is to be paid. I believe Mr. Paddison does not attempt to controvert my statement because he cannot controvert it as they are figures taken from the Settlement Report, and not from any data supplied by me. Without answering me directly, he referred me to some other figures at page 40, where the lease value of an acre of land is said to be Rs. 56. It is true that that is so, but the conditions of the lease from which this figure is arrived at may be such as may entail on the landholder some expenditure for cultivation expenses. It is like this. It is the practice in the district for the landlord who leases his land, to undertake to do the maramat work in the field after the harvest is over. It is also a familiar case in which the manuring in the fields is undertaken by the landlord where the lease is for one year. Whether this figure of Rs. 56 is arrived at on a consideration of this kind of lease or any other I am not in a position to say. But I am only suggesting that this figure of Rs. 56 given by him cannot be taken to be absolutely correct and that it is not a fair data on which it can be decided. There is one other point. This Rs. 56 is calculated on the average price for five years. That was during the years 1914—1918. Working from the tables given by the settlement officer himself, the average price works out at Rs. 321 per garce, leaving out small fractions. But the commutation price which has been taken into account for the purpose of settlement is Rs. 221. Calculated at the commutation price, the lease value of this comes only to Rs. 37 or Rs. 38 an acre which leaves only a margin of Rs. 28 an acre for land worth Rs. 1,100 according to the Settlement Officer, and I will confidently assert that it cannot be considered as an adequate return on Rs. 1,100, or as a sufficient margin for the increased cost of living which rules in this Presidency.”

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—“Were not the sale value and the lease value calculated for the same year?”

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—“Whether the sale deed was of the same year or not, I am not in a position to say. What he says is that the value of the land is Rs. 1,100. . . .”

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—“The sale value and the lease value are for the same years. You must apply your commutation price to the lease value with reference to the sale value.”

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—“While thanking for the explanation given, I must confess I am unable to follow the line of argument of my hon. Friend Mr. Paddison. If the line of his argument is that during the years 1914—1918 the value of the land is Rs. 1,100 and the lease value is

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [15th December 1923]

Rs. 56, let it be so. If the income from the land has gone down, his argument seems to be the price must have gone down. If the conclusion is that the price has gone down, then I must say that it is due to the economic condition in the district and there is no ground at all for enhancement of the tax.

“Another argument advanced by Mr. Paddison is that in calculating the average rate of tax which one acre of land in the district is paying, I have taken into consideration both wet and dry lands and said that the average was Rs. 5-8-0 an acre. If the hon. Member is anxious that the wet lands alone ought to be included, I am only saying that the tax which the wet lands will have to pay is much higher, being Rs. 7 or Rs. 7-8-0 an acre. That is a point in my favour which I want to urge before the House.

“Then the hon. Member Mr. Paddison was pleading: ‘What are the Ministers to do, what are the transferred departments to do if this rich district of Tanjore is to walk away with 12 lakhs of rupees which they are bound to pay.’ I quite confess that I am not pleading for any sympathy or any generosity from this House. I am only placing before this House the fact that the Tanjore ryot is already over-taxed, and that in justice and in fairness to him and on the recognized principles by which any settlement is to go on, he ought not to be asked to pay more. I said even yesterday that if after legislation and after testing the settlement rates of Mr. Jackson, this House or any committee that may be appointed by it, comes to the conclusion that the Tanjore ryot ought to pay more, the Tanjore ryot will in honour bound be willing to pay the increased rate of taxation. The hon. the Home Member asked me yesterday if the legislative measure can be given retrospective effect. Speaking for myself, and as a representative of the district, I see absolutely no objection in giving retrospective effect to the new legislation if the operation of the settlement proposals is suspended for a year.

“Then there are only one or two points which I wish to say in answer to the remarks made by the hon. Member from Chingleput. The hon. Member was saying that there was some inconsistency, there was unfairness to other districts in letting the Tanjore ryot go away scot free, paying the old rates. I do not think that it will be necessary for me to reiterate the arguments which I have already advanced yesterday to show that the Tanjore ryot was already paying a higher rate of taxation than the ryots in the other districts. It may be that Chingleput has been resettled and that other districts have been resettled, and as my hon. Friend suggested, when the legislation is passed, it will be time enough for this House to ask that the taxation should be revised and reduced if necessary. But what I am saying is that Tanjore is not bound to pay the new rates and till the new legislation is passed, let not those new rates come into force. I am certainly not asking for any special generosity or charity for the Tanjore ryot, for he is certainly entitled to it especially owing to the adverse circumstances which are prevailing there for the last two years.

“With these few words, I would crave the sympathetic consideration of this House for the Resolution which I have moved.”

Mr. V. HAMID SULTAN MARAKKAYAR:—“Mr. President, Sir, I rise to
12-30 p.m. give my whole-hearted support to the proposition now before
the House. My only regret is that it does not go far enough
and demand in emphatic language the permanent settlement of ryotwari areas

15th December 1923] [Mr. V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar]

in this Presidency which the ryots require and which this Council also by a Resolution has already favoured. I had therefore decided to support this proposition by a silent vote, but the speech of the hon. Mr. Knapp expounding the policy that is to guide the Madras Government in connexion with land revenue settlement was so reactionary and against public opinion that I feel it my duty to raise my emphatic protest against the sentiments he gave expression to. It is a matter of common knowledge that considerable dissatisfaction is felt by the poor ryots of the Tanjore district at the manner in which this Council, ignoring two of its own Resolutions, defeated the modest Resolution of my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar recommending that the adoption of settlement proposals in the Presidency may be postponed pending legislation embodying the principles of land revenue settlement or introduction of the permanent settlement of holdings. What are the two earlier Resolutions I refer to? The first Resolution was moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Siva Rao on the 15th February 1921 recommending to the Government 'that the adoption of resettlement proposals in the Presidency may be postponed till the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation'. This Resolution was discussed at great length and carried by an overwhelming majority, 76 voting for, 17 against, the hon. the Ministers remaining neutral. The principle of this Resolution was accepted by Government and the hon. Mr. Knapp was kind enough to say the other day that the Government had accepted the principle ten months even earlier than this Resolution and called on the Board of Revenue to prepare a draft Bill. The original Resolution of the Council being vague and not clear as to the lines on which legislation should proceed, the Council thought it its duty to give a definite idea to the Government as to the lines which will be acceptable to the Council, and so by a subsequent Resolution expressed emphatically in favour of permanent settlement. There is absolutely nothing inconsistent between the two propositions above referred to, but the wondrous part of the whole thing was that this Council by a majority rejected the Resolution of my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar embodying the substance of both the Resolutions. The hon. Mr. Knapp was kind enough to paraphrase the recommendations of the committee appointed by this Government, and pointed out that one of its recommendations was too bitter a pill for the Government to swallow, namely, that the decision not only as to the increase or decrease in assessment, but the final decision on every single matter of detail connected with resettlement should be absolutely with the Legislative Council, the Government being required to pass orders in accordance with the decision of this Council. I see neither any novelty nor any impending revolution by this recommendation made by the committee. The committee consisted of officials and non-officials and was presided over by the hon. Sir Habib-ul-lah Sahib, the Revenue Member, and if such a committee's proposal is to be treated as revolutionary, I don't know what will suit the taste of this Government. Further, what is the revolutionary character attributed to this recommendation? Is it the need urged therein that every single matter of detail should lie absolutely with the Legislative Council? If this is to be called revolutionary, we can very well drop the curtain over this farce of responsible Government now played in this Hall with so much trumpeting.

"Assuming that the Government considered this proposal most revolutionary and unacceptable to them and assuming also that the proposal for

[Mr. V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar] [15th December 1923]

permanent settlement did not find favour with the Government of India, what is the duty of the Government? They ought to have forthwith brought forward their own Bill and asked for its acceptance. Without doing this and ignoring their own acceptance of the principle that the principles of land revenue should be placed on a statutory basis they have gone on passing orders on resettlement proposals one after the other. But I am glad that so far as the Anantapur and Bellary districts are concerned, this Council has again by an overwhelming majority reaffirmed its determination not to allow resettlement orders to be brought to force without land revenue legislation being passed. It is a principle which is bound to apply to all districts in general and no amount of attempt made to rouse inter-district jealousies can be of any avail. Of course it is the usual game, but I think hon. Members of this House will not be a party to such tactics. I appeal to hon. Members to ignore any such appeal and to stand united for the principle which they have reaffirmed only the other day.

“One word to the Government. There is considerable unrest in the Tanjore district at the unjust enhancement of land revenue. Already prices have fallen and the position of the mirasidar has become miserable. They find it difficult to make both ends meet. If in this situation they persist in their attempts to raise the revenue they will be creating in the district a situation which it may become impossible to ease. Already the ryots are thinking of joint and concerted action to resist the increase if Government still persists. I warn the Government to take note of the situation. With these few words I support the resolution.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP.—“Sir, I do not want to detain the House for more than a very few minutes. This Resolution has been, as I think hon. Members will agree with me, thoroughly discussed, and I suppose it is probably the general desire of the House that we should bring the debate to an end. I feel all the same that the importance of the subject demands that I should say one or two words in closing. I do not propose again to go over the ground that we covered at such length on Thursday on the question how it was that legislation on this subject has not yet been introduced. I gave the fullest explanation which I possibly could; and if hon. Members wish to approach the same question again to-day, I can only refer them to the remarks I then made. Nor do I intend to follow the hon. the Mover of the Resolution in an examination of details of the Tanjore Resettlement Scheme which he has examined and laid before us with such profusion. I may congratulate him on the mastery which he has of the complicated subject, and I may envy him in the encyclopædic knowledge of Settlement matters which he has displayed. But I am afraid there are very many members of this Council, who, having no personal knowledge of Settlement procedure, must have found themselves rather entangled in the meshes of figures and statistics which my hon. Friend the Mover produced for their benefit, and who would have preferred this question to be put before them in the shape of some broad issue. That, Sir, is exactly my point, and the broad issue which I wish to place before the House is this: have any arguments been really brought forward to justify the proposal to relieve the Tanjore district of the obligation which for many years past has fallen on other districts in the Presidency, namely, the obligation at the end of every thirty years to face a revised settlement and to meet whatever rates our expert Settlement officers,

15th December 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

working on recognised standardized regulations, may recommend as leviable. That, Sir, is the perfectly broad issue, and it is to that issue that I would ask the House to confine itself.

"There are, however, one or two matters in my hon. Friend the Mover's speeches to which I must refer in rather greater detail, though very briefly lest the impression which he left on the House by his remarks might possibly confuse this one broad issue. One of the points to which he referred is the determination of the cultivation expenses. Now, Sir, comprehensive as is my hon. Friend's knowledge of settlement matters, I cannot help thinking that in his study he must have somehow overlooked this book called 'Instructions for conducting Resettlements in the Madras Presidency'."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"I have also looked into it."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Though my hon. Friend is aware of it, evidently he has not referred to it. This book lays down certain principles for the guidance of our Settlement officers in conducting a resettlement, and on the very first page of it, there occurs this instruction which I would like to impress on hon. Members: 'Except for special reasons no general reclassification of soils and no fresh calculation of grain outturns, cultivation expenses, etc., will be made.' Now, my hon. Friend complained that the Settlement officer had not dealt properly with the question of cultivation expenses, but has he put forward any special reason—and under the instructions given to the Settlement officer special reasons should be given in such cases—why cultivation expenses should be reviewed at all? I submit, Sir, that not a word has been said in support of the idea that, while in other districts cultivation expenses are not to be brought under review, in Tanjore alone that course should be followed."

"The other point to which he alluded is in regard to the commutation rates. The hon. the Mover has suggested that the Settlement officer was wrong in including in his years of calculation certain years of high prices, although they cannot be regarded as famine years, yet they were years of high prices. About that, Sir, I could argue at very great length with my hon. Friend opposite as to whether those years were or were not rightly included, but I am not going to do so. My short answer on this point—and it is one which I think the Council would do well to consider very seriously—is this. Taking the twenty years preceding the settlement and ascertaining the average rates of grain value during those years, the Settlement officer arrived at the conclusion that the average was no less than 83 per cent higher than the rates on which the previous settlement was based. But did the Government take that 83 per cent? It took 25 per cent in some parts of the Tanjore district and 18½ per cent in others, and I submit that between that 25 per cent or 18½ per cent and the 83 per cent which we found to be the admissible commutation rate, there is ample margin to cover any such errors of calculation on the part of the Settlement officer as have been indicated by my hon. Friend; that is to say, there is a margin of nearly 60 per cent to cover any such errors that may have occurred. That being the case, I do not feel in the least called upon to follow my hon. Friend, the Mover, in his intricate and complicated discussion of the commutation rates."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"I may be permitted to state that this 83 per cent comes to Rs. 4-15-0 per acre."

[15th December 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“ The margin is 83 per cent, Sir, according to our calculations. I am not now concerned with the figures per acre at present. I am content to base my statement on that percentage of 83.

“ Turning to the other speakers, there is one point to which I have had occasion to allude already, and to which I fear I must make a further reference. It has been said over and over again, and the statement has been repeated to-day, that the Government do not in fact propose to introduce legislation to put resettlements on a statutory basis. I think the statement was made more directly by hon. Friend for Coimbatore, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar; it was repeated in a more indirect form by Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar, and came up again to-day in another form from below the gangway. What Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar said, if I understood him aright, was that if you allow the Government to go on introducing resettlements before settlements are placed on a legislative basis, it will mean that Government will postpone that legislation. Against such a statement I must really protest. I have given the most positive assurance on the subject that we not only propose but are actually moving towards legislation on this subject, and that the legislation will be introduced at the first moment at which it will be humanly possible. After all, I would ask the House to remember that we on these benches are human beings and that if we are to spend our time in this Council from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. and in addition to get through the current work of our departments, it is not too easy to find time to sit down and work out all the details of so very important a legislative measure as this will be. I have already given my assurance, Sir, and I would suggest to my hon. Friends opposite that when an assurance is given from this bench on behalf of Government as to some future action which Government propose to take, it may very well be taken as a convention that the assurance should be accepted as true until it is shown to be false.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I never said anything like untrue or false. I said that, taking all the explanation that had been given, it was likely that the other works of Government would be considered more pressing and that this legislative work would be held on if there is no penalty attached to it.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“ I am very glad my hon. Friend did not intend his words in the sense in which I took them.

“ There is one noticeable point in connexion with which very many speeches have been made to-day, and to that I think I am entitled to refer. Practically all the speakers started by assuring the House that what we were discussing was purely a matter of principle, that we had nothing to do with Bellary or Tanjore, but that it was a question of principle as to whether Government should be allowed a free hand in making any resettlement. But unfortunately most of them, not excepting my hon. Friend below the gangway, were unable to resist the temptation to enlarge on the pitiful economic conditions of the ryots of Tanjore. I recognize their difficulty. They were between two stools; like those in that position fell between them. We spent a good deal of time yesterday in discussing Bellary, and the decision of the House was that the settlement in Bellary should be postponed until revenue settlement had been placed on a statutory basis. It was in that form that the Resolution was put to the House, but I say without any

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE 531
TANJORE DISTRICT

15th December 1923] [Mr. A. R. Knapp]

fear of contradiction that the main consideration, which was in the minds of the hon. Members of this House, as is shown by the trend of the debate, when they gave their vote for that Resolution, was the economic condition of the Deccan districts.

“It was admitted that the economic condition of those districts had not been favourable for some years past and that was a very prominent consideration in the minds of hon. Members when they voted for the postponement of the Bellary settlement. The closing speech of the hon. the Mover of the Resolution itself practically dwelt on that subject alone. The important question which the Members of the House have to ask themselves is, whether the criterion which they have applied to their vote on the subject of Bellary applies also to Tanjore. I submit, Sir, there is only one possible answer to that question and that is, ‘No’. Nobody can suggest that Tanjore is famine stricken and that its harvest is on the same precarious basis as that of the Bellary district. We all know of the rush there is for land in Tanjore and that it is very valuable property. The hon. Member for the University has accused me, or rather complimented me for trying to play upon inter-district jealousies. I am not doing anything of the kind. What I am doing is to ask the House to judge between the general interests of the tax-payers and the particular interests of one district. And when that one particular district is universally recognized as a prosperous one and when it comes forward and asks to be relieved from bearing its proper share in the taxation of the Presidency, then I consider that this House, which is charged, not with the interests of one district but with the interests of all, is entitled to take the wider view and whatever might have been the case in Bellary, to decide that Tanjore has no claim whatever to be exempted from the regular and ordinary scale of settlement taxation.”

The Motion was put and lost. A poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. B. Mahabala Hegde. | 23. Mr. S. Satyamurti. |
| 2. „ K. Prabhakaran Tampan. | 24. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 25. Rao Bahadur C. Gopala Menon. |
| 4. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 26. Mr. C. Maruthavanam Pillai. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 27. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 6. „ C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. | 28. Mr. G. Rameswara Rao. |
| 7. Mr. P. Siva Rao. | 29. „ P. C. Venkatapati Raju. |
| 8. „ A. Chidambara Nadar. | 30. „ Venkatarama Ayyar alias V. Pantulu Ayyar. |
| 9. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 31. „ B. Venkataratnam. |
| 10. „ J. Kuppuswami. | 32. „ Abbas Ali Khan Sahib. |
| 11. „ P. Anjaneyalu. | 33. „ G. Abdulla Ghatala Sahib. |
| 12. „ S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. | 34. „ V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 13. Diwan Bahadur S. Rm. Ct. Pethachi Chettiyar. | 35. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib. |
| 14. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhachari. | 36. Mr. T. M. Moidoo Sahib. |
| 15. Mr. P. Peddi Raju. | 37. „ Muhammad Moosa Sait Sahib. |
| 16. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 38. „ T. N. Bava Ravuttar Muhammad Sahib. |
| 17. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 39. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib. |
| 18. „ M. Seetayya. | 40. Mr. K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 19. „ M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 41. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. |
| 20. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 42. Mr. Janab Muhammad Yahya Ali Sahib. |
| 21. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar. | |
| 22. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | |

[15th December 1923]

Noes

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 24. Mr. P. V. Gopalan. |
| 2. „ Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 25. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Nayudu. |
| 3. „ „ C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 26. The Raja of Kurupam. |
| 4. „ the Raja of Kollengode. | 27. Honv. Lt. Madurai. |
| 5. „ „ Panagal. | 28. Mr. T. Mallesappa. |
| 6. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 29. Rao Bahadur A. M. Murugappa Chetti ar. |
| 7. „ Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnam Pillai. | 30. Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 8. Mr. Legh. | 31. „ B. Obalesappa. |
| 9. „ Madhavan Nayar. | 32. „ K. S. Ponnuswami Pillai. |
| 10. „ P. L. Moore. | 33. „ P. T. Rajan. |
| 11. „ G. F. Paddison. | 34. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 12. „ H. Tireman. | 35. Rao Bahadur P. Raman. |
| 13. „ C. Nicholson. | 36. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 14. „ P. W. Partridge. | 37. „ P. Sagaram. |
| 15. „ A. E. Rencontre. | 38. „ J. D. Samuel. |
| 16. „ A. J. Leech. | 39. „ K. Sarvarayudu. |
| 17. „ S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad. | 40. „ R. Srinivasan. |
| 18. „ Ari Gowder. | 41. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 19. „ P. K. S. A. Arumuga Nadar. | 42. Rai Bahadur Sir K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. |
| 20. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. | 43. Mr. T. V. S. Sundaramurthi. |
| 21. „ Devendrudu. | 44. „ O. Tanikachala Chettiayar. |
| 22. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Tyagaraya Chetti yar. | 45. Rao Bahadur C. Venkataranga Reddi. |
| 23. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiayar. | 46. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| | 47. „ M. Ratnaswami. |
| | 48. „ Venkatachala Padayachi. |

42 voted *for* the Motion and 48 *against* it. The Motion was declared lost amidst Opposition cheers.

The House then (12-55 p.m.) rose for lunch.

The House re-assembled after lunch at 3-30 p.m., the hon. the President in the Chair.

V

MOTION REGARDING THE HON. THE PRESIDENT'S RETIREMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“ Mr. President, I beg leave to move—

That the thanks of this Council be given to the hon. the President for his distinguished services in the Chair for nearly three years; that he be assured that this Council greatly appreciates the ability and impartiality with which he has discharged the duties of his high office, through the first period of the existence of this Reformed Legislative Council, and the judgment and firmness with which he has maintained its privileges and dignity; and that the Council desires to place on record its deep and abiding sense of gratitude for the courtesy and attention which he has uniformly shown to its Members, which has earned him the respect and esteem of all sections of the same.

“ I deem myself especially fortunate, Sir, in that it falls to my lot to make the motion to-day, not only because I am sure I shall find myself for a change in the position, not of having ‘practically no following’ (laughter) but of having the unanimous following of the whole Council (hear, hear), but also because it is a great pleasure to me personally to be allowed to voice the universal feelings of this House, of admiration, respect, and honour and, if I may say so, of affection (hear, hear) for one who has served his country so well for something that is coming nigh upon forty